

REMARKS

By this Amendment, Applicants amend claims 1, 5, and 7 and cancel claims 9-32 without prejudice to, or disclaimer of, the subject matter therein. Thus, claims 1-8 are pending in this application. Support for the amendments may be found at least in paragraphs [0097] - [0099] and FIG. 10. No new matter is added. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims at least in light of the following remarks.

The Office Action objects to the abstract as failing to comply with MPEP §608.01(b). Applicants respectfully note that the portion of MPEP §608.01(b) relied on by the Office Action sets forth a suggested format for the abstract rather than a required format.¹ However, in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants amend the Abstract to comply with the suggested format of MPEP §608.01(b). Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection.

The Office Action objects to the title as non-descriptive. By this Amendment, Applicants amend the title to be even more descriptive of the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection.

The Office Action rejects claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as indefinite. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

In particular, claim 7 does not recite a broad range and a narrow range referring to the same feature. By this Amendment, Applicants amend claim 7 to further emphasize that the claim does not recite a broad range and a narrow range referring to the same feature. Accordingly, claim 7 is definite and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

¹ Specifically, the many suggestions of MPEP §608.01(b) recite that an abstract "should" have various qualities. This is contrasted with the only requirement of MPEP §608.01(b), wherein the "abstract must commence on a separate sheet."

The Office Action rejects claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Applicants alleged admission of prior art (AAPA) or U.S. Patent No. 6,459,551 (Hayakawa), in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,626,922 (Miyanaga). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

In particular, neither AAPA, Hayakawa, nor Miyanaga disclose, teach, or suggest that "each of the insulating films has a thickness of 0.1 nm to 0.2 nm," as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over AAPA, Hayakawa, and Miyanaga. Further, claims 2-6 are patentable for at least the reasons that claim 1 is patentable, as well as for the additional features they recite.

For example, neither AAPA, Hayakawa, nor Miyanaga disclose, teach, or suggest that "the insulating films formed by the chemical vapor deposition are formed through the use of a plurality of chambers such that a first one of the insulating films is formed in one of the chambers, and subsequently a next one of the insulating films is formed in another one of the chambers," as recited in claim 5. The Office Action alleges that Miyanaga discloses this feature. However, Miyanaga does not disclose a first one of the insulating films formed in one of the plasma generating space 1, the supplementary space 2, or the heating space 3, and a next one of the insulating films being formed in another one of the plasma generating space 1, the supplementary space 2, or the heating space 3.

Also, neither AAPA, Hayakawa, nor Miyanaga disclose, teach, or suggest that "the insulating films formed by the chemical vapor deposition are formed through intermittently injecting a material for making the films," as recited in claim 6. The Office Action alleges that Miyanaga discloses this feature. However, Miyanaga only discloses that the electric power for generating the power has a pulsed waveform, which is not equivalent to intermittently injecting a material for making the films, as recited in claim 6.

In view of at least the foregoing, claims 1-6 are patentable over AAPA, Hayakawa, and Miyanaga. Applicants thus respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

The Office Action rejects claims 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over AAPA or Hayakawa, in view of Miyanaga, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,763,021 (Young). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

This rejection is premised upon the presumption that the combination of AAPA or Hayakawa, in view of Miyanaga teaches all of the features of claim 1 (Office Action, p. 6). Because, as discussed above, the combination of AAPA or Hayakawa, in view of Miyanaga does not teach all of the features of claim 1, the rejection is improper. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

In view of at least the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Applicants earnestly solicit favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Jesse C. Collier
Registration No. 53,839

JAO:JOC/hs

Attachment:
Substitute Abstract

Date: April 24, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--